

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 17-28 are allowable if they are rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Examiner also indicated that claims 29-36 are allowed. Applicant gratefully acknowledges the indication of allowable subject matter.

The Examiner rejected claims 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) as being anticipated by Kitazawa (US Patent No. 6067421). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The present invention as claimed in claim 15 has a piezoelectric actuator arrangement that is supported by the element to be displaced. As a result, the piezoelectric arrangement of the present invention moves with the element to be displaced. This feature makes the adjusting device simple and very inexpensive to manufacture.

This feature is recited in claim 15 as “a piezoelectric actuator arrangement which is supported by an element to be displaced for moving . . .” and **“said piezoelectric actuator arrangement moving with the element to be displaced”**. As in previously cited references, Kitazawa fails to teach a piezoelectric arrangement that moves with the element to be displaced as recited in claim 15.

The Examiner asserted that FIGS. 13 and 14 of Kitazawa teaches such an arrangement that moves with the element to be displaced. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Kitazawa discloses that a piezoelectric device 1 is connected with a stopper 7. The stopper 7, however, is fixed to a camera body (not shown) (see col. 4, lines 29-33). Accordingly, the piezoelectric device 1 cannot move with the element to be displaced (the element to be displaced in Kitazawa are frame 4 and lens 3).

On the contrary, as clearly shown in FIG. 1, a lever 2 transfers the expansion of the piezoelectric device 1 to the element to be displaced. In the device of FIGS. 13 and 14, the expansion of the piezoelectric device 1A and 1B directly acts on the holder 19 to be displaced.


Contrary to the Examiner's assertions, the piezoelectric device 1B is not fixed to the holder to be moved. As disclosed at col. 8, lines 23-26, **"One face of a projection (not shown) provided at a lower part of the holder 19 abuts against one face of the laminate piezoelectric device 1B."**

The piezoelectric device 1B therefore acts directly on the projection of the holder 19 and is not fixed to the holder 19. Since the piezoelectric device 1B is shown as fixed to the stopper 7 in FIG. 13 and the stopper 7 is described as being fixed to the camera body, the piezoelectric device 1B cannot move with the element to be displaced. Kitazawa neither teaches nor suggests a piezoelectric element that is supported by the displaceable element and that moves with the displaceable element.

Applicant submits that Claim 16 is also patentable by virtue of its dependency from claim 15.

Based upon the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and its earlier allowance. Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorney would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact him at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Harry K. Ahn
Reg. No. 40,243

REED SMITH LLP
599 Lexington Avenue, 29th Floor
New York, NY 10022
GHK:HKA